

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 12 are amended, and claims 13-16 are added to recite features supported in the specification, for example, page 8, line 2 – page 9, line 11, page 10, line 16 – page 11, line 5; page 12, line 26 – page 14, line 11, page 16, lines 11-17 and Figs. 1-6. No new matter is added by any of these amendments.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Ehichioya and Mohammad during the January 5, 2005 personal telephone interview, for which Applicants' record of the interview was filed January 7, 2005.

Reconsideration based on the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Amendment Entry with Request for Continued Examination

Entry of this amendment is proper under 37 CFR §1.114 because this Submission is filed in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination.

II. Claims 1-16 Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,815,704 to Shimotsuji *et al.* (hereinafter "Shimotsuji") in view of U.S. Patent 5,963,952 to Smith. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Shimotsuji and Smith, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a data input form retrieving system, comprising a character string extracting unit that extracts a character string from each of plural data input forms containing character strings and makes up a text file containing the extracted character strings in association with a corresponding data input form, extracting conditions input unit that inputs a condition of extracting a specific data input form from the plural data input forms, and a data input form extracting unit that extracts the specific data input form by retrieving the character string contained in the text file in accordance with the extracting condition inputted by the extracting condition input unit, as

recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 5 for a data input form retrieving method, and in claim 9 for a computer-readable recording medium.

In addition, Shimotsuji and Smith, individually and together, fail to teach or suggest a data input form retrieving system, comprising keyword adding unit that adds a keyword inputted by a user or automatically generated by natural language analysis to each of plural data input forms, an extracting condition input unit that inputs a condition of extracting a specific data input form from the plural data input forms, and a data input form extracting unit that extracts the specific data input form by retrieving the keyword added by the keyword adding unit in accordance with the extracting condition inputted by the extracting condition input unit, wherein a text file containing the keywords extracted from the data input form is made up when the keywords have been extracted from each of the plural data input forms, as recited in claim 4, and similarly recited in claim 8 for a data input form retrieving method, and in claim 12 for a computer-readable recording medium.

Nor do Shimotsuji and Smith teach or suggest a data input form retrieving system, comprising a character string extracting unit that extracts a character string from each of plural data input forms containing character strings in accordance with a predetermined rule for extracting the character string from a specific kind of character string part, an extracting condition, input unit that inputs a condition of extracting a specific data input from the plural data input forms, and a data input form extracting unit that extracts the specific data input form by retrieving the character string extracted by the character string extracting unit in accordance with the extracting condition inputted by the extracting condition input unit, as recited in added claim 13, and similarly recited in claim 15 for a data input form retrieving method.

Instead, Shimotsuji discloses techniques for document registration and retrieval based on input of image data for a new document. In particular, Shimotsuji teaches extracting line data in step S15 and characters in step S21 based on formats from step S2 in which form data

registered in the file memory are displayed and the user selects one form with which to observe the document (col. 3, lines 40-50, col. 4, lines 21-34 and Figs. 3 and 6 of Shimotsuji). The Final Office Action asserts that Shimotsuji discloses keyword adding means (col. 1, lines 33-36 of Shimotsuji). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Shimotsuji teaches only inputting a keyword to retrieve data desired by a user (col. 1, lines 33-41 of Shimotsuji). Applicants' features in claim 4 recite "adding... a keyword inputted by a user or automatically generated by natural language analysis to each of plural data input forms" and "retrieving the keyword added by the keyword adding unit in accordance with the extracting condition", which are not taught or suggested by Shimotsuji.

Further, Smith discloses a data entry system for an internet browser. In particular, Smith teaches passing a document to a data entry state 74 after being presented to a new browser window for enabling data to be entered. Smith also teaches writing tags into a secondary document and writing data extracted from a primary document into the secondary document as initial values for the tags (col. 5, lines 42-64, col. 6, lines 54-63 and Figs. 4 and 5B of Smith).

There is no motivation to combine features related to the data line extraction of Shimotsuji with the data entry technique of Smith, nor has the Office Action established sufficient motivation for a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even assuming that motivation to combine the applied references could be established, the combination fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed features, as discussed above.

A *prima facie* case of obviousness for a §103 rejection requires satisfaction of three basic criteria: there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or knowledge generally available to modify the references or combine reference teachings, a reasonable expectation of success, and the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP §706.02(j)). Applicants assert that the Final Office Action fails to satisfy these requirements with Shimotsuji and Smith.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims are now patentable over the applied references. The dependent claims are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all the claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gerhard W. Thielman
Registration No. 43,186

JAO:GWT/gwt

Attachments:

Amendment Transmittal
Request for Continued Examination

Date: April 1, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--